

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

SAMIRA ZEITOUN,

Plaintiff,

V.

PNC BANK, et al.,

**Defendants.**

CASE NO. 1:15 CV 1655

JUDGE DONALD C. NUGENT

MEMORANDUM OF OPINION  
AND ORDER

On August 18, 2015, plaintiff *pro se* Samira Zeitoun filed this *in forma pauperis* action against PNC Bank, Jessica Thomas, and Mark Gregg. The brief complaint contains few allegations, stating only that plaintiff was verbally and emotionally harassed and screamed at by the individual defendants, and that she was told to go home. Plaintiff went to the hospital with a severe anxiety attack “due to daily harassment.” For the reasons stated below, this action is dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e).

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2), a pleading must contain a “short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009). The pleading standard Rule 8 announces does not require “detailed factual allegations,” but it demands more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation. *Id.* A pleading that offers “labels and conclusions” or “a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do.” *Id.* Nor does a complaint suffice if it tenders naked assertion devoid of further factual enhancement. *Id.* It must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to “state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Id.* A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable

inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged. *Id.* The plausibility standard is not akin to a “probability requirement,” but it asks for more than a sheer possibility that a defendant has acted unlawfully. *Id.* Where a complaint pleads facts that are “merely consistent with” a defendant's liability, it “stops short of the line between possibility and plausibility of ‘entitlement to relief.’ ” *Id.*

Even liberally construed, the complaint does not contain allegations reasonably suggesting plaintiff might have a valid federal claim. *See, Lillard v. Shelby County Bd. of Educ.*, 76 F.3d 716 (6th Cir. 1996)(court not required to accept summary allegations or unwarranted legal conclusions in determining whether complaint states a claim for relief). Accordingly, this action must be and is hereby dismissed under section 1915(e). The court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

  
DONALD C. NUGENT  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE